



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,974	07/15/1999	VIKTORS BERSTIS	AT9-99-123	4395
35525	7590	11/12/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			SHAH, NILESH R	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC				
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75380			2127	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/353,974	BERSTIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nilesh Shah	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al (6,105,012) (hereinafter Chang) in view of Sasich et al (6,661904) (hereinafter Sasich).
4. As per claim 1, Chang teaches the invention substantially as claimed including the use of a data processing implemented method comprising:

initiating a session, requesting a first web page, receiving the web page (col. 4 line 1-20, col. 8 lines 15-20, col. 8 lines 39-45)

encrypting the web page (col. 4 lines 20-22, col. 4 lines 61-62, col. 8 lines 43-55)

Chang does not teach the use of securing information stored in a cache.

Sasich teaches the use of securing information stored in a cache (col. 7, lines 25-30; col. 7, lines 46-55; col. 13, lines 30-40; col. 14, lines 57-65).

5. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Chang and Sasich in order to have a secure cache. By having Sacich's secure cache system, a third party may not access information associated the cache (i.e. personal information).
6. As per claim 2 Chang teaches a method, wherein the step of encrypting the web page further comprises coding the web page using a browser supported encryption algorithm (col. 11 lines 20-25, col. 12 lines 15-25).
7. As per claim 3, Chang teaches a method wherein the step of encrypting the web page further comprises coding the web page using an encryption application not supported by the browser (col. 4 lines 10-15, col. 11 lines 20-25, col. 12 lines 15-25).
8. As per claim 4, Chang teaches a method wherein the step of encrypting the web page further comprises selecting a browser supported encryption algorithm for encrypting the web page (col. 11 lines 20-25, col. 12 lines 15-25).
9. As per claim 5, Chang teaches a method wherein the step of caching the web page further comprises providing a remote cache location (col. 7 lines 14-17).

10. As per claim 6, Sasich teaches a method wherein one of the browser and the browser cache is protected from unauthorized users (col. 7, lines 45- 55; col. 13, lines 30-47). Chang teaches that there are different levels of security and verification. A password is a well known method of verification.
11. As per claim 7, Chang teaches a method wherein the step of encrypting the web page further comprises defining a path for storing the web page that directs the web page to memory locations for encrypted data (fig. 2, col. 5 lines 13-45, col. 4 lines 48-60).
12. As per claim 8, Sasich teaches a method recited wherein web page information that is cached and then paged is paged as encrypted web page information (col. 7 lines 42-46; col. 15 lines 25-28; col. 13, lines 30-47).
13. As per claim 9, Chang teaches a data processing implemented method for securing information stored on a browser cache, the method comprising:
 - opening an application using a browser (col. 3 line 64- col. 4 line 8)
 - performing an application specific function on the application using the browser,
 - wherein application specific information is produced (Fig. 1, col. 3 line 64- col. 4 line 8).Chang does not teach the use of securing information stored in a cache.

Sasich teaches the use of securing information stored in a cache (col. 7 lines 25-30; col. 7 lines 46-55; col. 13, lines 30-47).

14. As per claim 10, Chang teaches a data processing associated with a browser, the method comprising initiating a session (col. 4 line 1-20, col. 8 lines 15-20, col. 8 lines 39-45).

Chang also teaches the step of decrypting data wherein the decrypted data is the requested information (col. 16 lines 9-13, col. 9 lines 53-59).

15. Chang does not teach the use of securing information stored in a cache.

Sasich teaches the use of decrypting data contained in the browser cache, where in decrypted data is associated with information content stored in the browser cache (col. 8 lines 37-40, col. 7 lines 46-50; col. 13, lines 30-47).

16. Claims 11-20 are rejected based same rejected from claims 1-10 above.

17. Claim 21 is rejected based on claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's remarks filed on 7/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2127

In the remarks applicant argued: (a) combination of Chang and Sasich is not done in a proper way (b) Sasich does not teach encrypting data (c) Sasich does not teach a secure cache.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants argument: As per (a), Sasich clearly teaches motivation for such a combination (col. 14 lines 58-65); (b) Sasich clearly teaches the use of encrypting data (col. 7, lines 25-30; col. 7, lines 46-55; col. 13, lines 30-40; col. 14, lines 57-65); (c) Sasich teaches a secure cache (col. 7 lines 45-50) ‘Each raw data cache will be encoded to operate at a designated level of security’.

Examiner would also like to note additional references as noted in previous action: The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shaw et al (6,104,392) teaches the use of a password to obtain information stored in a cache. Mages et al (5,892,825) teaches the use “retrieving the encrypted data to a specific cache directory location” (col. 60 lines 17-55). Vinson et al (6,453,3340 teaches the use of blocks of data that are always stored in the cache file in encrypted form (col. 13 lines 3-21).

Conclusion

19. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2127

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

NS
October 6, 2004


MENG-ALI AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100